

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/981,982	09/981,982 10/19/2001		Yoshihiro Matsuyama	1573.1009	7504	
21171	7590 06/19/2006			EXAMINER		
STAAS & H	IALSEY L	LP	TORRES, MARCOS L			
SUITE 700 1201 NEW Y	ORK AVEN	NUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGT		•	2617			

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
		09/981,98	09/981,982 MATSUYAMA E		ΓAL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	Γ		
		Marcos L.	Torres	2617			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati	on appears on the	cover sheet with th	e correspondence ad	ddress		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR DEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IS IN THE MAILING IS IN THE MAILING IS IN (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. y period will apply and wing statute, cause the apply	HIS COMMUNICATI ent, however, may a reply be III expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr lication to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this of DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠ 2a)□ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice u	This action is nallowance except	for formal matters,	-	e merits is		
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 3-5,9-11,16,17,20 and 21 is/are was claim(s) is/are was claim(s) is/are was claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 3-5,9-11,16,17 and 20-21 is/are claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction on Papers	ithdrawn from cone rejected. and/or election re	nsideration.				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Ex The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) b correction is require	e held in abeyance. Sed if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	• •		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ r No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		O-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/981,982 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-8-06 has been entered.
- 2. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-5, 9-11, 16-17 and 20-21have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 4. Regarding applicant representative arguments regarding to the combination of the references, any person skilled in the art at the time of the invention, even a person not skilled in the art, would know the benefits of a broadband connection over a narrowband (slow) connection. For example the system would be more efficient and faster and users would have to wait less for the service, thereby increasing user satisfaction.

Application/Control Number: 09/981,982 Page 3

Art Unit: 2617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 8. Claims 3-5, 9-11, 16-17 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivula (US 6,795,711) in view of Hicks, III US 20040261112A1 and further in view of Adachi US006829474B1.

Art Unit: 2617

As to claims 3 and 9, Sivula discloses an information processing apparatus (see fig. 3, item 36) comprising a processor receiving a content transmission request including a content identification of a content determined by a user and an address of a receiving device (see fig. 1, item 16) determined by said user which is to receive data of said content (see col. 7, lines 20-25,62-67), from a separate device (see fig.1, item 10) different from said receiving device over a mobile communication network, in response to the receipt of said content identification and said received address of said receiving device from said separate device, said processor transmitting, said received content identification and said received address of said receiving device to a content data providing information processing apparatus which provides said content data, wherein the content data is adapted to be provided by said content data providing information processing apparatus to said receiving over said broadband network (see col. 5, line 66 col. 6, line 5; col. 7, lines 47-52; col. 8, lines 28-44)). Sivula does not specifically disclose that the connection is a broadband (high-speed) connection or that the content data information processing apparatus is different from said first information processing apparatus. In an analogous art, Hicks discloses that the connection to the Internet is a high-speed connection (see par. 0017), thereby permitting to receive and send data or content faster. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these teachings for the simple purpose of an enhanced user experience. In another analogous art, Adachi discloses a content data information processing apparatus is different from said first information processing apparatus (see fig. 1, items 1, 6, 7), thereby permitting to connect various content

Art Unit: 2617

server connected to the internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine these teachings for enlarging the content and services offered to customers (see col.4, lines 53-55).

Page 5

As to claims 4 and 10, Sivula discloses the information processing apparatus wherein said processor transmits a Web page containing said content identification to said separate device over said mobile communication network (see col. 7, item 49-53).

As to claims 5 and 11, Sivula discloses the information processing apparatus according to claim 3 wherein said processor transmits further a user identification of the user to said content data providing information processing apparatus (see col. 7, lines 23-25).

Regarding claims 16-17 and 20-22, are corresponding stored program claim of the apparatus claims 3-4 and 9-10. Therefore they are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

571-273-8300

for formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Application/Control Number: 09/981,982 Page 6

Art Unit: 2617

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcos L. Torres whose telephone number is 571-272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-6:00 PM alt. Wednesday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marcos L Torres Examiner

Art Unit 2617

mlt

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER